

Re. Box No. V

IP20 Rec'd PCT/PTO 28 JUL 2006

- 1 Reference is made to the following documents:
D1: EP 1 225 763 A (SONY CORP) July 24, 2002 (2002-07-24)
D2: SAMBOL M: "THE SIP BUDDY LIST SYSTEM ADVANCED INTERNET SERVICES FINAL PROJECT" THE SIP BUDDY LIST SYSTEM: PROJECT PROPOSAL, [Online] 1998, XP002188925 Found on the Internet: URL: <http://www.cs.columbia.edu>; [found on 2002-02-01]
D3: ROSENBERG J ET AL: "AN XML FORMAT FOR PRESENCE BUDDY LISTS" INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE, June 15, 2000 (2000-06-15), XP002266630 Found on the Internet: URL: <http://www.watersprings.org/pub/id/draft-rosenberg-impp-buddylist-00.txt>; [found on 2004-01-12]
2. INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1,5,7 AND 14
- 2.1 The present application does not fulfill the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject matter of claim 1 is not novel within the meaning of Article 33(2) PCT. Document D1 discloses (the references in brackets refer to this document):
 1. Method for supporting services of an IP-based video network (Fig. 1, 34, 35, p.6/sect.56, p.7/sect.62, p.14/sect.129, p.15/sect.138), characterized in that:
 - a) a subscriber of the video network is, if desired, registered via his/her IP-capable terminal as a user of a presence-based service with a presence server (p.8/sect.74)
 - b) said subscriber is logged on via his/her IP-capable terminal to the presence server as soon as his/her terminal becomes active, whereby as part of said logging-on information about the presence status of the subscriber is stored by the presence server (p.7/sect.62,70, p.6/sect.74, p.16/sect.140),
 - c) corresponding presence information about other subscribers is made available by the presence server to said subscriber with the aid of his/her IP-capable terminal when a corresponding request is made (Fig.5/52, p.8/sect.76-79).

Objections cited previously also extend to independent claims 5, 7 and 14 which are related to claim 1 (with regard to "Internet", cf. p.2/sect.3, p.3/sect.15, p.14/sect.126).

3. DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-4, 6, 8-14, 16
Claims 2-4, 6, 8-14, 16 contain no features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, fulfill the requirements of the PCT in relation to novelty or inventive step.

Re. Box No. VIII

Clarity

4. While claims 1, 5, 7 and 14 were drafted as separate independent claims, they appear in fact to relate to one and the same subject matter and differ from one another apparently only due to deviating definitions of the subject matter for which protection is desired.

For this reason the claims are not worded concisely and do not fulfill the requirements of Article 6 PCT.

5. The application does not fulfill the requirements of Article 6 PCT because claim 12 is not clear: the serial number of claim 12 appears twice.